SUBJECTS.

*Mr K. C. Mathevan Pillai* (Member, Ambalapuzha Taluk) also requested that the tax on Kandukrishi lands might be commuted into money. At present, the ryots had to spend about 150 paras of paddy for every 100 paras that they had to pay as tax. He also added that the change was not likely to cause any great loss to Government.

The Member also requested that Government might be pleased to recognise alienations of Kandukrishi lands. Under the existing rules, Kandukrishi lands were not alienable. At present, the registry-holder had only the right to hold the lands and pay the pattom on it. He said that there was no objection to permit the alienation of the lands by the holders, as by such action the alienee obtained all the rights enjoyed by the original holder and was answerable to the Sirkar as much as the latter. Further, looking into the practice itself, alienations were as a matter of fact taking place every day, and such alienations were being recognised by the Civil Courts (*Vide* 18, T. L. R., page 157). At the recent settlement, several lands were registered in the names of persons other than the original holders. Another circumstance which worked hardship was the restriction imposed by Section 7 A of the Civil Procedure Code, under which no Civil Court could take cognisance of any suit relating to Kandukrishi lands, unless the plaint was accompanied by an order of Government permitting the plaintiff to seek redress in the Civil Courts. There was at present great difficulty and delay in obtaining the permission of Government in such cases. He therefore requested that, in consideration of the above circumstances, Kandukrishi lands might be declared alienable, and that, if that could not be done, the portion relating to Kandukrishi lands be omitted from Section 7 A of the Civil Procedure Code.

*Dewan's reply.*—The suggestions of the members are noted. I would add that His Highness' Government do not contemplate making any changes in the tenure or the system of management of the Kandukrishi lands.

***teration of the kist months for puncha ands.***

*Mr. K. C. Mathevan Pillai* (Member, Ambalapuzha Taluk) said that the kist months for the puncha crop, *viz.*, Medom and Edavom, were fixed without regard to the actual time of harvest, which continued till the end of Edavom. It would not be possible for the ryots to pay the tax before the crops were harvested and the paddy sold. Further, prior to 1079, the kist months were Edavom and Mithunom. He therefore requested that the kist months might be altered from Medom and Edavom to Edavom and Mithunom.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

*Dewan.*—Supposing that no kist month could be adopted for Mithunom, would you prefer the existing state of affairs by which half the kist is paid in Medom and the other half in Edavom, or would you pay the whole amount in one month, *viz.*, Edavom?

*Member.*—In that case, we would rather pay the whole kist in Edavom.

*Dewan's reply.*—It will not be convenient, for purposes of collection, to have any kist after Edavom. The proposal to adopt a Mithunom kist cannot therefore be accepted. His Highness' Government recognise that, as puncha crops are generally harvested early in Medom, it would probably be to the convenience of the ryots if Medom *is not* a kist month. Probably, the best thing would be to have only *one* kist for the puncha lands and that in Edavom. A change, however, like that could not be made except after a very careful enquiry. The Peishkars will be asked to consult the leading ryots holding puncha lands and ascertain if they would prefer to have a single kist in Edavom or continue to have two kists as now, in Medom and Edavom.

***Desirability of registering the bunds of paddy fields &c. and the trees standing thereon permanently in the names of the owners of the adjoining lands.***

*Mr. A. Narayanan Unnithan* (Member, Kottarakara Taluk) said that the practice now was to record all bunds of paddy fields as poramboke and to lease them out on kuthagapattom to the owners of adjoining lands or to any others who applied for them. Such bunds were intended merely for the protection of the adjoining lands. The owners of those lands generally kept them in good condition, spending much money and labour on them and planting trees on such bunds and they had from a long time been in enjoyment of them. At the settlement, the bunds were generally included under the head of 'poramboke' and the applications of the occupants for registering them in their names were being refused on the ground that they were poramboke. He therefore requested that, as in the case of other Sirkar lands, such bunds should also be permanently registered in the names of the owners of the neighbouring lands.

*Mr. M. Sivathanu Pillai* (Member, Tovala Taluk) requested that the trees standing on poramboke lands, such as field bunds &c., should be registered in the names of the growers at a reduced rate of pattom. Such trees were at present being leased on kuthagapattom without any limit of time under the Rules dated 27th Karkadagom 1074. The rules did not provide for any uniform rate of pattom, which latter was therefore being fixed arbitrarily by the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly